BD 143 396 dc 770 420

AUTHOR TITLE Bers, Trudy; Jaffe, Phil
An Analysis of Prerequisites and Performances by
Introductory Chemistry Students: Spring 1977.
Oakton Community Coll., Morton Grove, Ill.
Aug 77

EDRS BRICE DESCRIPTORS

.INSTITUTION

PUB DATE

MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.

\*Academic Achievement; Adult Students; \*Chemistry;
College Science; Community Colleges; Degree
Requirements; Dropouts; Failure Factors;
Institutional Research; \*Junior Colleges; Junior
College Students; Questionnaires; School/
Registration; Student Motivation; \*Success Factors;
Transfer Students

IDENTIFIERS

\*Course Prerequisites

#### ABS TR'ACT

In an effort to determine success characteristics of introductory chemistry students, 135 enrollees in seven introductory. chemistry classes at Cakton Community College were surveyed in the spring semester, 1977. Of the 120 respondents, it was found that 75% had enrolled because of curricular requirements in a career field, and only 8% did so because of interest in the subject. Only 68% had met course prerequisites, regardless of the type of registration process (regular, open, late) through which they had been admitted. Sixty-four students successfully completed the course, and of these, students who did not have prerequisites were as likely to be successful as those who did: Of the 16 who failed who did not have prerequisite instruction, 13 were from two of the seven chemistry sections. Ten out of 11 students enrolling for transfer credit were successful... Of students under age 25, 51% were successful, while 65% of those above 25 received passing grades. Of the latter, 15 or 88% earned A or B grades, while only 50% of the 48 younger successful students received an A or B. Efforts to follow-up students who dropped the course were unsuccessful. The survey and drop-out questionnaires are appended. (RT)

ED143396

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF

EDUCAMON
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
TITING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED, DO NOZ NECESSARLY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE" THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emily B. Kirby

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS"

AN ANALYSIS OF PREREQUISITES AND PERFORMANCES

BY INTRODUCTORY CHEMISTRY STUDENTS: SPRENG 1977

Trudy Bers, Ph.D. Associate Professor Political Science

> Phil Jaffe, Ph.D. Professor Chemistry

Oakton Community College

August, 1977

The authors would like to thank Dr. Emily Kirby and her staff, who provided coding and keypunching assistance.

The research project reported in this paper was undertaken because of questions and concerns we had regarding several aspects of students' enroll-ments and performances in introductory chemistry classes. These concerns focused on several main topics, each of which will be discussed below.

First, however, we will describe the methods by which data were collected.

In the first two weeks of the spring semester; 1977, faculty teaching introductory chemistry classes were asked to have their students complete a short questionnaire which provided information about students' career goals; reasons for taking the course, enrollment process, and completion of and performance in prerequisite courses and other chemistry classes (see Appendix I). There were nine introductory chemistry courses in this term and seven were included in this study (see Table 1). Of the 135

## Insert Table 1 here

students enrolled in the seven classes as of February 2, 120 (88.9%) completed the questionnaire. We also attempted to contact students who dropped the course to determine the primary and secondary measons they did so; however, this proved a very time consuming task and the low number of respondents makes further analysis of these data unwarranted (see Appendix II for the questions asked).

Questionnaires were not anonymous; this was true for two reasons. First, to enable us to correlate the second (drop-out) half of the survey with the appropriate first part, and second, to enable us to determine each student's final grade in the course. The admissions office provided us with these.

Having described the reasons for this study, strategies and instruments for data collection, and types of data analyzed, we turn now to our findings. These will be treated under the major topics of concern which led us to the study in the first place.

#### Reasons for Taking Chemistry

We asked students why they enrolled in chemistry; fully three-quarters did so because it is a career prerequisite, and only 8% did so because of interest in the subject. We also asked what students' career goals were; as expected, nursing was the most frequent choice, with some 30% indicating this. Eighteen separate career goals were noted in total, and only 15 people gave no specific answer. A total of 74 respondents, or 55% of the total number, indicated some type of health-related field as a career goal. The only other field with a sizable number of aspirants was engineering; 14 respondents designated this as their primary interest. It appears, then, that enrollment in introductory chemistry courses is motivated primarily by students' needs to meet curricular requirements. They are taking chemistry because they have to. This by itself, however, gives little insight into other aspects of our inquiry.

### Prerequisites and Enrollment

A major concern through past years is that stidents seemed to enroll in chemistry courses without having met course prerequisites. We attempted to document the extent to which this was happening, the reasons for its occurrence, and the affect of not having prerequisites on students performances.

While administering questionnaires faculty were asked to list course prerequisites; students were then asked a series of questions about them.

Eighty percent claimed to have known what the prerequisites were; and an additional 8% knew some of them. However, only 68% of students had met

we attempted to account for the means by which nearly one-third of the students were able to enroll without these requirements by asking them how they were able to register for the class. Eleven, 25% of those without these requirements, said they did have them when they registered.

Ninetsen, 44% of the group, were not asked about prerequisites. Eight were told they did not need them. It appears, then, that during the registration process a fairly sizable number of students who do not have stated prerequisites is able to register anyway, and that in 71% of these cases respondents did not even have to pretend to have them.

In order to understand this further, we explored whether students without prerequisites clustered their registration in one of the three types of processes: regular, open, or late registration. We found virtually no differences. That is, students without prerequisites were registered in chemistry courses in all three types of registration: regular, open, and late. This suggests that no one type of registration facilitates this enrollment; students in the massive open enrollment are no more likely to lack prerequisites than those enrolling in regular, or late registration where, presumably, more careful controls by faculty or peer advisors can be imposed.

## Prerequisites and Performance

Concern about course prerequisites is based on the assumption that these prerequisites provide information and skills necessary for success in the chemistry course itself. In order to validate this empirically, we divided students into two groups based on their final course grades.

Students who received grades A,B,C, and D were designated "successful," and placed in one group. One might quarrel with our definition of D as

a successful mark; it does provide credit, however, and in any case only four students received Ds. Students who received an R,W,N at midterm, dropped the course, or received an X were designated "unsuccessful," We included the X grade in this group because credit in the regular term was not earned and because a large number of X grades ultimately become R grades anyway. We then looked at the relationship between the success variable and prerequisites, hypothesizing that students without prerequisites would fall disproportionately into the "unsuccessful" category. To our surprise, this was not the case. As Table 2 shows, students who have not completed prerequisites are as likely to complete their chemistry courses successfully as students who have their pre-requisites. Of the 64 students who successfully completed the course

## Insert Table 2 here

and for whom prerequisite data were provided, 69% had prerequisites.

The percentage of unsuccessful students who had prerequisites was also 69%. Put another way, 31% of the successful students and 31% of the unsuccessful students did not have course prerequisites.

Because this finding so contradicted our expectations we decided to investigate other variables which might explain it. We turned to the variables sex and age; intuitively, we believed that older students returning to school, aspecially women, might account for the lack of association between prerequisites and performance. We divided our respondents into two groupsabased on age; those below age 26 we designated "young," and those above age 25 we designated "returning." This follows the Oakton practice of designating women above age 25 as "returning women." We found that 23 of the 26 returning students were women, and that 12 of

these women and one returning man did not have prerequisites. That is, 50% of returning students did not have prerequisites, while only 26% of young students did not. We anticipated that returning students might perform successfully in their courses regardless of prerequisites, making up for this lack through superior study habits and conscientiousness. However, we found that returning students who did not have prerequisites were equally as likely to be unsuccessful as young students without prerequisites. (45% of returning students without prerequisites were unsuccessful)

I We then turned to where prerequisites were taken to see whether this might help explain the lack of correspondence between prerequisites and success in the courses. We found, however, that whether a student had taken prerequisites at Cakton, another community college, a four-year college, or in high school, mide little difference in success rates.

We found some indications that students who had taken their prerequisites less than two years prior to the course were more likely to be
unsuccessful than those who had taken them more than two years ago. This
suggested some relationship between performance and age, since quite.
obviously older students were more likely to have taken their prerequisites
earlier. This is a finding to which we will return later.

We also reevaluated recipients of the X grade in relation to prerequisites, thinking that these individuals might be highly motivated but unsure of fundamental skills and, therefore, in need of additional time to successfully complete their courses. Again, however, we did not find support for this; seven of the eleven X-grade recipients did have course prerequisites.

As a final attempt to understand our finding we checked whether in

specific sections of chemistry courses prerequisites were related to success. Here at last a pattern began to emerge. As Table 3 indicates;

#### Insert Table 3 here

the predicted relationship between prerequisites and course success

(i.e., that not having prerequisites is correlated with unsuccessful performances) does occur in two of the three chemistry 101 sections; it is reversed, however, in other chemistry courses, all but one person without preprequisites successfully completing other chemistry courses. While this finding is suggestive and warrants additional investigation, even speculations about why this is so are premature at this time.

### Other Factors Related to Performance

In order to achieve a more complete understanding of student characteristics which are empirically related to successful performances in chemistry courses we investigated a variety of other variables. In each case we related the variable course success (again defined as A through D = successful; X, W, N, R, or drop = unsuccessful) with a theoretically significant characteristic of the student.

Our findings are more interesting for relationships <u>not</u> demonstrated than for those few which received empirical support. We found no consistent relationship between course success and any of the following:
full or part-time student status; semester at Oakton (first, second, etc.); career goal; or whether the individual had the same instructor for the first term of a sequence course.

We did find some relationships between course success and reasons
for taking the course, with students enrolling for transfer credit
successful in ten.of eleven cases.

Finally, we returned to the variable of age (again using the year 25 as the cut-off for "young" students) and related it directly to performance. We found that 51% of young students were successful in their courses, and 65% of returning students were successful. Not only were returning students more likely to be successful than younger ones, they clustered in the higher grade categories. Of the 17 successful returning students, 15 (88%) earned As or Bs. Of the 48 successful young students, only 50% earned As or Bs. Put another way, 95% of the Cs and 3 of the 4 Ds awarded were earned by young students. In sum, returning students are more likely to pass their chemistry courses and, within the pass category, to earn a disproportionate share of As and Bs. While this finding comes as no surprise, it is one of our few findings which was fully consistent with our expectations.

## Summary and Conclusions

Our findings, briefly summarized, include the following:

- &. Three-quarters of students enrolled in introductory chemistry courses did so primarily because the course was a career requirement.
- 2. Slightly over half the students enrolled in introductory chemistry courses planned on a career in the health fields.
- 3. One-third of students enrolled in introductory chemistry courses did not have all course prerequisites prior to the beginning of the course.
- 4. Students who did not have prerequisites registered in all types of Cakton registration: regular, open, and late.
- 5. Students who did not have prerequisites were as likely to complete their courses successfully as students who did have prerequisites.
  - 6. Nearly all students who did not have prerequisites and who were

unsuccessful in their courses were enrolled in two chemistry 101 sections. In other chemistry courses students who did not have prerequisites were almost always successful.

- 7. Students who enrolled in chemistry courses to obtain transfer credit had the highest rate of success of any group of students.
- 8. Returning students were more likely to pass their chemistry courses than young students.
- 9. Of all students who passed, returning students earned a dispropertionate ortionate share of As and Bs and young students earned a disproportionate share of Cs and Ds.

Our findings cause us to recommend several additional avenues of research. These include:

- 1. Replication of this study to determine whether are findings hold true across several semesters.
- 2. Expansion of this research model to other disciplines. We found that gathering basic data at the beginning of the term enables us to include students who later drop out and who are, therefore, not part of a typical end-of-term analysis.
- 3. Focusing on prerequisites, including what is required as a prerequisite, why these prerequisites are required, and possible reasons why the prerequisite/performance pattern fails to conform to expectations.
- 4. Review of the registration process to determine how one-third of chemistry students were able to enroll in courses without having course prerequisites.

One additional methodological note should be added. One of our major original intents was to gather data pertaining to the reasons

for students' dropping chemistry courses, and our research design provided for this through Part II of our questionnaire. We even obtained students' phone numbers on Part I to facilitate telephone follow-ups. We found, however, that neither telephone nor mailed follow-ups generated enough reponse to warrant analyzing our meager data. We still believe this is a viable method for obtaining valuable data about our high drop-out rate, but adequate resources, especially personnel, must be allocated if this is to prove effective.

TABLE 1
COURSES AND STUDENTS

Course	Section	Enrollment <sup>a</sup>	Complet	lons	<b>\</b>
101	. 01.	24	27 <sup>b</sup>	· * .	_
, 101	02	22	20	• •	
101	50	24	18	•,	
102	os.	14,	- 1í		
102	· 50 ·	13	9	•	
105	50	14	12	, •	
121	50	24	19		•
No course	or section	identified	4	a	
,			120	•	*.

As of February 7,1977

bPossible because of early drop-outs and late registrants

TABLE 2

# PREREQUISITES AND PERFORMANCE

		Prerequisites Completed				
• • • •	Performance	A11	Some	None	Total.	
<u>\$</u>	Successful	474.	11	9, ~,	64	
	Unsuccessful	38	. 10/	7	55	
- brandon 22	Total	82	21	16		

TABLE 3
COURSE SECTIONS, PREREQUISITES, AND SUCCESS

			Performance -					
Course	Section		Successful	Unsuccessful				
io	αī		3	10				
101	. 02 ,		Ţ	3				
101	50	<b>,</b>	5	2				
102 %	or or		. 2	0	•			
102	50		1	0 .	. • " •			
· 105	50	,	3	1	•			
121	<b>50</b> ^,		4					

Entries are only for those students who did not have all prerequisites

For office use:	Nam	ie:	
ID# (4-3). Chemistry (4-6)		A	\
Section (7)	. •	<i>'</i> , '	
CULTUTETON COM	,*	•	•
CHEMISTRY SUF	RVEY	4. 7	
In order to help us improve our counseling a help us Yearn more about students enrolled Please complete this questionnaire. We assuremain confidential. Thank you.	in chemistry.	we need voor	haln
Are you enrolled at Oakton as a fulltime or	a parttime's	tudent? · •	•
(8)1 Fulltime			
2 Parttime	, .	•	
Which semester at Oakton is this for you?	•		٧.,٠
(9)1 First			
2 Second	, o	,*	``
3 Third	,		, ·
4 Fourth 5 Other		<b>*</b>	
		4 3	•
What is your career goal?		•	
(10-12) write in answer		• •	
Sex			·
(13) 1 Female			
2 Male	•		
How old are you?	· · · · · ·		
(14-15)		> 7	
Which of the following reasons was most impo	ntant'in your	decision to	take Chemistry?
(16) 1 Pre-requisite for career	<b>*</b> )		
2 Interested in subject 3 Needed course for job adv	ancement .	•	L
4 Needed for transfer to an 5 Other (specify)	other school,	•	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
	rite in other	reason ·	<del></del>
	4	•	•

	Did	you	know	tha	the	prere	equisi	tes, fo	ir th	nis c	ours	e ar	e	,	,		
	٠,	(17)	·		Yes		•	. (				,		•	•		
			,		No Knew	some-	prere	quisit	es			•	.A.	ι.	, a.		
	Did	you '	have	the	se pri	erequi	isites	befor	e ta	king	thi	s co	urse?				<b>~</b> ` · ·
•		(18)	,	2	Yes No Some	٠.	answer	is ye	es, s	skip	next	3 q c	uesti ontin	ons ue i	go oro	to A a ler)	nd
	•	If a this	nswer seme	to este	above r?	e is r	no or	some,	aré	you •	ţaki	ng a	ny of	thes	se pr	erequi	sites
		(19)			Yes No		,		- •	•	,	,	•	:	,	•	à
•	· · ·	How	did y	⁄οu (	compl	ete re	gistr	ation	for	this	cou	rse	witho	ųť th	ne pr	rerequi	șites?
	, a '	[2 <b>0</b> ]	-	2	-Wasn	't ask	woulked ab	dn't n out th	eed Lem	them		(	7	•		;	,
٠			If a Who	ind ind	er to	above d you	e is 1 would	(told	l I w	ould the	n't i prer	need equi	thėm sites	) ?·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
		•	(21)		2 4 5 6	Peer Chemi Other Frier Decid	advis stry facu	instru lty me self	ictor mber		•	•		nel)			
A	Hòw	lo <del>s</del> ol	, ann	did	vou 1	Fako t	haca	. ' prereq			4	α1131 -	MC1	;	•	٠ -	,
	•	(22)		$-\frac{1}{2}$	Less 2-5 y More	than ears than	2 yea ago 5 yea	rs ago		•			***	·		· ·	
	-	(23)	-		At Oa	, .	erequ	isites	•	,			,	•	٠,		المراجع المراج المراجع المراجع المراج
•	K		·	_ 2 _ 3 _ 4	At ar At ar High	nother nother Schoo	four,	unity year	co11 co11	ege (	or ur •		rsity swer		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	
			•			• •	. *	ester	at (	Dakto	ņ?	* .		-	3	•	
	· · · .	(33)		1 2 3	Regul Open Late	ar reg regis regis	gistra tratio tratio	ition on on (aft	ter (	class	es s	tart	~ ( _ ed:) (		: •	/ · 5	, , ,

	ršt semester of this cou	rse sequence?	SECOND SEN	DESTER SEW
	s (If yes, go to D)	<b>\</b>		
When was the	first semester taken?		, ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(28)	1 Previous semester 2 Two semesters before 3 More than two semest	ers before	*-	
Where was the	ne first semester taken?		A	
	1 At Oakton 2 At another community 3 At another four year 4 High School 5 Other (specify)	r college or univ		
	5 Other (Specify)	write in a	nswer	
What was yo	ur grade in the first se	mester course?		1
(30)	2.8 3 C 4 D 5 F 6 X or incomplete			
· . · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 Other (specify)	write in	answer	·
Did you have the s	ame instructor for the f	,		
(31)	1 Yes 2 No 2 S			
			. ****	
750°		*		· , · · •

Why did you drop this course?	· ·	• *	4	we .	-
(24) 1 Toò diffi	out #		•	4	
2 Conflict			يُع م	•	
		tives: cou	rse not ne	eded .	ı.
3 Changed of 4 Personal	or family p	roblems		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
5 Lack of t	ransportati	on ·		•	
6 Financial	. reasons	<b>,</b>	•	* *	.′
7 Other (sp	ecify)	<u> </u>			•;
		wri	te in ans	ver	·:
		· •	, , , , , ,	; -	÷
If answer to above was too diff	icult (or d	idn't like	eacher)	ask:	
Why did you feel the course was	too diffic	ult? The	maior read	nn 9*	,_
(25) 1 Was 2d se 2 Too much	/ -	• 1	ALC:	er Samera Maria da Samera	. •
(25) 1 Was 2d se	mester cour	serand had	n had f	irst" seme	ster
2 Too much	work		5, ** .	۹.	. ,
	ke instruct	oř.		·	•
4 Didn't 1:	ke book		1.1		
	hours in le		Tap '		,
6 Poor math	i background	a	*	** **	•
7 Didn't li	ike course a	pproacn	*		· .
" U.MUU my UI	ecify)	t	٠,	, ·	,•
y ocher (sp			· , •		<del></del>
	•	Wri	te in ans	ver	
What was the good make demand		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
What was the second most import	ant, reason	MuX rue co	urse was i	oo aliij	carca
(26) 1 Was 2d se	mester cour	se and had	n't had f	iret como	eter
2 Too much		. ',	.'	rrać, ajeme	ster,
3 Didn't li		or	`• .	<b>.</b>	. ,
4 Didn't 11	lke book	,			
5 Too many	hours in le	cture and	lab 🐉		
6' Poor math	ı background	*,	3.	• '' ''	
7 Didn't 1i		pproach	,	ه دو مراسع	•
8 Not my th			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
9 Other (sp	ecify)	<del></del>	*	- ' '	<u> </u>
	•	Wri	te in ansv	ér	+
	2.				٤.
When drop-out occurred	,			1	•
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		, 'r'		_ •
(34) 1 Before or	at mid-ter	m	•	14	۷.
2-After mid	l-term :	•	1		
		,		*	
the second second second	. ,	me			
	, ·	•	,	. •	- Bo

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES

OCT 1 4 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES